



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,082	03/02/2004	Takeo Yoshida	118918	2490
25944 7590 01/10/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			EXAMINER LOUIE, OSCAR A	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

AK

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/790,082	Applicant(s) YOSHIDA, TAKEO	
	Examiner Oscar A. Louie	Art Unit 2136	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: _____.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amended independent Claim 1 recites additional limitations "from the client apparatus," that is generated by the client apparatus based on user identification information input into the client apparatus," "generated by the client apparatus," "input into the client apparatus".

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:


Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 102 & 103 rejections:

- The applicant's argument regarding Claims 1 & 5 that Zhang does not disclose or suggest "a connection server including a seventh unit for performing an authentication process by using the second connection authentication information" has been considered but found non-persuasive due to the existing broad scope of the current set of claims, reading on the primary reference.
- The applicant's argument regarding Claims 3, 6 & 7 that Zhang does not disclose or suggest "authentication server transmitting the connection server address to the client apparatus," has been considered but found non-persuasive due to the existing broad scope of the current set of claims, reading on the primary reference.
- The applicant's argument regarding claims 9, 11, & 12 that Zhang does not disclose or suggest "receiving and transmitting unit for receiving a connection server address from the authentication server," has been considered but found non-persuasive due to the existing broad scope of the current set of claims, reading on the primary reference.
- The applicant's argument regarding claims 10 & 13 that Zhang does not disclose or suggest "a transmitting unit that transmits to the authentication server information indicating that the connection server has shifted to a wait state," has been considered but found non-persuasive due to the existing broad scope of the current set of claims, reading on the primary reference.
- The applicant's argument regarding Claims 1 & 5 that Leveridge does not disclose or suggest "a message digest of the first connection authentication information," has been considered but found non-persuasive due to the existing broad scope of the current set of claims, reading on the primary and secondary reference.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph rejections:

- The applicant's arguments regarding the "associating" and "predetermined method" have been considered and found persuasive for the examiner to withdraw his standing 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph rejections for these aspects of the claims only.
- The applicant's arguments regarding the remaining 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph rejections has been considered but found non-persuasive due to the lack of clarity over what appears to be a first authentication performed by one apparatus, and a second authentication performed by another different apparatus at a later point in time.

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


1/8/08